

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action of June 13, 2008. Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42-43 and 46-63 are pending. Claims 1 and 42 are amended by this response. No new matter is submitted and support for these amendments can be found at least at page 14, lines 7-18 of the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

**I Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 68-, 12-15, 17-20, 42-43, 46-48, 53 and 55-63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,842,898 ("Carlson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,446 ("Torii"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 3-5, 16, 21-24, 49-52 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson in view of Torii in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,879,995 ("Chinta"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Carlson discloses system for monitoring a plurality of related threads. The plurality of related threads is polled for status information by a monitoring thread. Responsive to receiving the status information, a determination is made as to whether a thread within a plurality of related threads is active. If a thread is determined to be inactive (e.g., a printer hardware error is preventing a print thread from completing), the monitoring thread initiates a cleanup processes for the thread based on the status information.

The Office Action states that Carlson discloses placing status information relative to an executable process into a status value data structure that is accessible to any node capable of accessing a process management system. For support, the Office Action cites Col. 5, lines 34-36 and Col. 9, lines 65-67. These sections of Carlson state that a "...parallel port provides some public methods that may be used to see if the port is active" while discussing monitoring of printer threads. However, the publicly available

information of Carlson is not information relative to the printer process. Instead, it is information that is merely relative to the status of the parallel port. The monitoring thread can use information about the parallel port's status in its determination of the status of one or more printer threads being monitored, but Carlson does not disclose or suggest that that printer thread status information is then made publicly available or that it is provided to a client other than the client that initiated the thread. To the contrary, the Carlson merely discloses that the monitoring thread uses the status information to clean up and kill off threads that seem to be unable to complete.

Torii discloses a multi-processor system in which a program is divided into several instruction streams, and each stream is executed as a thread. A thread manager may be shared with the several thread processors or be distributed to the several thread processors. A thread status table manages execution status of each thread processor and parent-child relation. A thread sequencer requests a thread generation and permits its termination in accordance with the content of the thread status table. However, like Carlson, Torii does not disclose or suggest that status information about a thread is made publicly available or that it is provided to a client other than the client that initiated the thread.

Chinta discloses a system for performing message logging for networked applications running on application servers, which can be running a JSP engine. However, like Carlson and Torii, Chinta does not disclose or suggest that status information about a thread is made publicly available or that it is provided to a client other than the client that initiated the thread.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and its dependent claims are each patentably distinguished from the cited art. For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 42 and its dependent claims are each patentably distinguished from the cited art.

**II M.P.E.P. §707.07(j)**

M.P.E.P. §707.07(j) states:

“...If the examiner is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, the examiner may note in the Office action that certain aspects or features of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims may be given favorable consideration...”

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make Applicants aware of any subject matter disclosed by the present application which the Examiner believes is patentable. By doing so, the Examiner would help expedite prosecution by enabling Applicants to amend the present claims or draft new claims directed to such subject matter.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: September 15, 2008

Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

By: /MacLane C. Key/

MacLane C Key, Reg. No.: 48,250  
Attorney for Applicant  
Direct telephone (703) 647-6566

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

September 15, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar